DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 272 456 SP 027 773

AUTHOR Zeichner, Kenneth M.
TITLE Teacher Induction Practices in the United States and Great Britain.
PUB DATE Apr 79
NOTE 51p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (San Francisco, CA, April, 1979).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Beginning Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; Inservice Teacher Education; Mentors; *Program Evaluation; Teacher Improvement; *Teacher Orientation
IDENTIFIERS *Beginning Teacher Induction; England; United States

ABSTRACT

This paper examines beginning teacher induction programs in both the United States and Great Britain. Descriptions are given of the scope and activities in 11 selected programs in the United States: (1) the NASSP Project; (2) Washington State; (3) Oswego, New York; (4) Hawaii; (5) Wheeling, Illinois; (6) Wilmette, Illinois; (7) New York City; (8) South Texas; (9) Washington, D.C.; (10) Salem, New Hampshire; and (11) Alabama. The major elements in these programs are: (1) released time for beginning teachers; (2) an experienced teacher mentor; (3) released time for mentors; (4) supervisory training for mentors; and (5) instructional contact with university personnel. A discussion is presented on the results of evaluations of the programs. Five classes of variables were included in the evaluations: (1) user satisfaction and extent of program implementation; (2) teacher turnover; (3) teacher performance; (4) teacher attitudes and morale; and (5) pupil performances and attitudes. A description is presented of the Teacher Induction Pilot Scheme (TIPS) which was implemented in the urban districts of Liverpool and Northumberland in England. A five-page bibliography is included. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED272456

Teacher Induction Practices in the United States and Great Britain

Kenneth M. Zeichner
University of Wisconsin, Madison

A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, April, 1979.

SP 027 773

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

K. M. Zeichner

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Teacher Induction Practices in the

United States and Great Britain

> Induction to teaching must be dealt with as a pertinent stage in career development. A new teacher should not be left to the isolation of his own classroom, to succeed or fail depending on his ability, ingenuity, and resilience. He should not be pressured into certain approaches to teaching merely because of the prevailing system or an imposed climate. He should be treated for what he is--a beginner--and be given the time and assistance he needs to develop his own teaching style. (NCTEPS, 1966, p. vii)

The idea that the education of a teacher should extend beyond the completion of a pre-service preparation program and continue throughout a teacher's career has a long history in American teacher education. For example, Shaplin and Powell (1964) and the Association for Student Teaching (1968) point out that various forms of graduate internship programs have been proposed and/or implemented since the latter part of the nineteenth century. Today, there is widespread agreement that pre-service preparation alone can, at best, prepare teachers to a point where they are at a readiness stage to enter the profession (McDonald, 1978). The need for continuing and more situation-specific training is taken for granted in the literature of teacher education.[1]

Given this widespread agreement about the need for career-long training, three distinct phases have commonly been identified in the education of a teacher: (1) pre-service--the four or five year period preceding provisional certification; (2) induction--the first few (probationary) years of teaching following the completion of pre-service training and provisional certification but preceding permanent certification; (3) in-service--the period following permanent certification and continuing throughout a teacher's career. The present paper is concerned with the induction phase of teacher education and with the diversity of program models that have been developed specifically for the support of beginning teachers in the United States.[2]

A second purpose of this paper is to examine evaluation data related to recent experimentation with teacher induction practices in Great Britain and to look at the implications of these data for the development of new induction models in the United States.[3] Along with the publication of the Plowden Report (1967) and the James Report (1972), which focused in part on the lack of support during the probationary year of teaching, many efforts have been made in Great Britain to study the experiences of probationary teachers (e.g., Collins, 1969; Taylor & Dale, 1971; Hanson & Herrington, 1976). After the White Paper (1972) outlined a plan for the national implementation of new induction models, government sponsored experimental efforts were begun formally in two districts (Liverpool and Northumberland) and informally in several others. The present paper will draw on some of the tentative findings from this Teacher Induction Pilot Scheme with a view toward ferreting out the implications of this work for the United States. Despite differences in the structure of teacher education in the two countries, the British data on teacher induction is extremely useful for illuminating the strengths, weaknesses, and possible pitfalls in various program designs and can readily be adapted to the development of new induction models in the United States.

Teacher Induction in the United States

A Continuing Concern with the Problem of Induction

In the last 15 years since the publication of the Conant Report (1963), which contained several specific recommendations for the support of beginning teachers, the induction phase has received a great deal of attention in the literature of teacher education. The first few years of teaching have been defined by many (e.g., Bush, 1966) as the most critical period in a teacher's career. According to a recent NIE document, there is common agreement that

> the conditions under which a person carries out the first year of teaching have a strong influence on the level of effectiveness which that teacher is able to achieve and sustain over the years; on the attitudes which govern teacher behavior over even a forty year career; and, indeed on the decision whether or not to continue in the teaching profession. (N.I.E., 1978, p. 3)

Given this agreement about the importance of the first few years of a teacher's career, many individual educationists (e.g., Ryan, 1970; Bush, 1977), established educational organizations (e.g., NCTEPS, 1966; A.S.T., 1968; Leiter & Cooper, 1978), state departments of education (e.g., Florio & Koff, 1977), and institutions of higher learning (e.g., University of Wisconsin, 1978) have pointed out the need for better induction programs for beginning teachers. The development of sound teacher induction programs has also recently become a priority for the National Institute of Education (Vaughn, 1979).

However, despite the repeated calls for the development of programs designed specifically for beginning teachers and the implementation of several experimental models, such programs are minimal or nonexistent for the majority of beginning teachers in 1979. Presently, as pointed out by Howsam et al. (1976, p. 101), "many new teachers function in a professional desert, abandoned by the institutions where they received their pre-service education, and neglected by overburdened school supervisory personnel." This conclusion about the lack of formal teacher induction efforts has consistently been reached by those who have examined the actual experiences of beginning teachers (e.g., Hermanowicz, 1966; Bouchard & Hull, 1970; Gorton, 1973). As Lortie (1975) points out, teaching seems to be the only profession where the beginner becomes fully responsible from the first working day and performs the same tasks as a twenty-five year veteran.[4]

As a result, the first few years of teaching are a time of great stress, anxiety, and isolation as evidenced by several first-hand accounts of beginning teachers (e.g., Ryan, 1970), by empirical studies of the induction period (e.g., Jersild, 1966; Eddy, 1969), and by the substantial amount of literature focusing on the problems faced by beginning teachers (e.g., Dropkin & Taylor, 1963; Broadbent & Cruickshank, 1965). There is also evidence that the first year of teaching leads to increasing negativism and rigidity in the attitudes of neophytes (e.g., Day, 1959; Hoy, 1968). Many neophytes, lacking adequate support, decide to leave the profession during this period (Bush, 1966). Even today, with the apparent teacher surplus, "teacher wastage" is still a major human tragedy, especially in our inner-cities (Howey et al., 1978). Beginning teachers now, as they have in the past, clearly express a desire for the added support that so few apparently receive. Despite the many studies on the problems and needs of beginning teachers, this information has not been adequately used to help neophytes gain and fulfill their full potential (Ditosto, 1974).

Although it is becoming increasingly clear that teacher educators need to reexamine current policies and practices for teacher induction, it is not the case that we must start from scratch in the development of new program models. Since 1895, when Brown University implemented the first internship program, many different models have been proposed in theory and/or implemented in practice. As Shaplin and Powell (1964) point out for the pre-1963 period, many common elements are contained in these models, although program developers often claim uniqueness for their own programs.

This same situation holds true for the numerous induction programs developed during the period 1963-1978. Consequently, the first step in any new attempt to develop effective models for teacher induction should be to examine what has been learned from past efforts and then to build upon this knowledge in the design of new programs. Following is a limited analysis of teacher induction efforts in the United States since the publication of the Conant Report in 1963.

Models of Teacher Induction

A review of the literature has indicated that there are two major types of teacher induction programs that have been implemented in the last fifteen years. They are: (1) internship programs--degree related induction programs for beginning teachers, and (2) beginning teacher programs--nondegree related induction programs for beginning teachers. Furthermore, there are several variations within each of these two major categories. Internships seem to fall into three major classifications: (1) fifth year internships (e.g., M.A.T. programs for liberal arts graduates); (2) the internship as part of a five or six year integrated preparation program; and (3) the Teacher Corps internship. On the other hand, beginning teacher programs are distinguished in the present paper according to the nature of program sponsorship and the level of implementation. For example, these programs have been implemented at school, school system, regional, state, and multistate levels. L.E.A.'s, I.H.E.'s, S.E.A.'s and regional education centers have all been variously involved in the design, implementation, and evaluation of these programs. The present paper is limited to an analysis of selected beginning teacher programs and will employ the following definitions for limiting the scope of the study:

> Beginning Teacher: One who has completed all pre-service training requirements (including student teaching); has been granted a provisional certificate; is in the employ of a school district; has generally the same type and degree of responsibilities assigned

more experienced teachers; and is either in his or her first year of service to the profession or to a particular school district.

Beginning Teacher Program: A planned program which is intended to provide some systematic and sustained assistance specifically to beginning teachers for at least one school year. The persons providing the support are specifically assigned that responsibility.

Given the limited scope of the present analysis, eleven selected beginning teacher programs will be examined for which there exists some evaluation data.[5] Since all of these programs came after Conant's (1963) recommendations and several of them contain elements advocated by Conant, a brief look at Conant's statement on teacher induction is in order. After arguing that local school boards have been "scandalously remiss" in failing to provide adequate support for beginning teachers, Conant (1963, pp. 70-71) recommends five specific kinds of help that should be given to beginning teachers:

> During the initial probationary period, local school boards should take specific steps to provide the new teacher with every possible help in the form of: a) limited teaching responsibility; b) aid in gathering instructional materials; c) advice of experienced teachers whose own load is reduced so that they can work with the new teacher in his own classroom; d) shifting to more experienced teachers those pupils who create problems beyond the ability of the novice to handle effectively; e) specialized instruction concerning the characteristics of the community, the neighborhood and the students he is likely to encounter.

All of the programs which will now be examined contain one or more of the support mechanisms advocated above in addition to other factors not mentioned by Conant. In fact, one of the programs, the N.A.S.S.P. Project in the Induction of Beginning Teachers (Hunt, 1968) was designed specifically to test the validity of Conant's advice. Before looking at the evaluation data related to these programs, the major elements of each program will now be briefly described. The programs are presented in chronological order.

Capsule Description of Eleven Selected Beginning Teacher Programs

1. The N.A.S.S.P. Project on the Induction of Beginning Teachers (Hunt, 1968; Swanson, 1968)

This project was a three-year experimental effort (1965-1968) funded by the Carnegie Corporation and designed specifically to test the validity of Conant's recommendations concerning teacher induction. The final year of the project involved 188 beginning high school teachers in 33 schools in 5 states. There were two major purposes to the project: (1) to give beginning teachers extra time and help so that they might better develop professionally; (2) to discover through experimentation means by which the first years of teaching might be improved. Despite a great deal of variation among local projects, there were four elements that all sites held in common: (1) the teaching loads of beginning teachers were reduced by one class period; (2) experienced teachers were appointed to work with 3-8 beginning teachers and were given a reduced workload of one period; (3) assistance was given to beginning teachers in finding and using good instructional materials; (4) beginning teachers were provided with special information on the characteristics of the community, student body and school policies.

Individual and group assistance was provided to beginning teachers on an as needed basis within a four-phase framework: Phase I--a pre-service orientation; Phase II—a beginning of school orientation supplemental to or in place of the regular school orientation program; Phase III--a first semester program focusing on the "practical"; Phase IV—a second semester program involving a gradual shift from practical concerns to more long range and theoretical concerns. Program activities included group seminars, observations of experienced teachers, analyses of videotaped lessons and team teaching. A formal and independent evaluation of the project was undertaken by the

R&D department of the Detroit Public Schools in 1967. This evaluation consisted of a series of questionnaires given to beginning and cooperating teachers and analyses of logs kept by the beginning teachers. The focus of the evaluation was on the kinds of help most valued by the beginning teachers and on the nature of program impact.

2. The Washington State Modified Internship for Beginning Teachers (Hite et al., 1966; Hite, 1968)

Following a request from the Washington S.E.A. for experimental efforts to improve conditions for first year teachers, Hite et al. (1966) designed an experiment to test the effects of reduced work loads and intensive in-service training on the attitudes and behaviors of beginning teachers. The project, which ran during the 1965-66 school year, involved 120 beginning elementary teachers from five school districts. There were three different experimental treatments and one control group (30 teachers per group). Two of the experimental groups were given a 25% reduced teaching load (1/4 daily released time) and either were observed by and conferenced with a district supervisor twice a week or visited classrooms of experienced teachers twice a week. The third experimental group was given only a 25% reduced teaching load (25% fewer pupils). The control group received no special treatment other than the regular school district orientation procedures. The four groups were matched on the basis of their grade level assignment and grade in student teaching. Each beginning teacher (experimental and control) was observed four times with a classroom observation system and completed an attitude scale prior to each visit. A follow-up study was conducted during 1966-67 with ten randomly selected teachers from each group to determine whether the effects of reduced loads and support persisted.

3. The Oswego N.Y. Plan for Team Supervision of Beginning Teachers (Readling et al., 1967; McGinnis, 1968)

Funded by the New York S.E.A., this experimental effort was designed to help first year teachers to improve their classroom performance and to reduce the beginning teacher dropout rate. The program consisted of an experienced teacher (team leader) trained in a specific model of supervision working with a team of four-five beginning teachers in the same building. The focus was on the team members providing mutual assistance through observations and analyses of each member's teaching. The goal was to have beginning teachers eventually develop habits of self-analysis. A significant feature of this program was that the supervision provided was totally divorced from regular school district evaluation procedures. Nothing that took place in the team sessions was ever communicated to building administrators. In the first year of operation (1967-68) the program involved 127 beginning teachers in 20 schools with a team leader in each school. Money was given to each school district by the S.E.A. to provide released time for team members as the district saw fit. An evaluation conducted by the S.E.A. was still in progress at the time the program descriptions were written. Tentative results are reported.

4. The Beginning Teacher Development Program in Hawaii (Noda, 1968)

This pilot program which was a joint effort of the University of Hawaii, the Hawaii S.E.A. and local L.E.A.'s was a statewide effort to provide added support to beginning teachers. During its first year of operation (1966-67), the program involved 500 beginning teachers in over 100 elementary and secondary schools throughout the state of Hawaii. Forty-eight experienced teachers were appointed to provide supervision for beginning teachers at a ratio of about 1:10. Each supervisor worked in several schools and was given some released time for supervisory activities, but it is not clear from the report

of the program how much released time was provided. The overall goal of the program was to develop "self-directing" beginning teachers. This program, unlike many others, did not separate the supervisory support from regular school district evaluation procedures. Each supervisor was required to submit an assessment of his or her beginning teachers to the building principals at the end of the year. Two University of Hawaii consultants provided supervision courses and individual consultations for the supervisors. An evaluation of the program was conducted, but it is not clear from the data presented what procedures were used.

5. The Wheeling, Ill., Teacher In-service Training Program (Johnson, 1969)

This federally funded (Title 3) program which began in one high school with 22 beginning teachers in 1967-68 was later expanded to include additional schools and experienced teachers. The L.E.A. was totally responsible for planning, implementing, and evaluating the program. The focus of the program was on getting beginning teachers involved in assessing their own classroom behavior and in seeing their students as individuals. The content consisted of one full day per month released time for beginning teachers to attend seminars in groups of 8-10. The seminars were staffed by district personnel. Some additional but unspecified amount of released time was also provided for beginning teachers to observe in the classrooms of more experienced teachers. The content of the seminars varied according to the expressed needs and concerns of the beginning teachers. Additionally, many simulation exercises were utilized which focused on interpersonal and group dynamics. Seminar sessions were videotaped to enable participants to become more aware of their own behavior. An evaluation conducted by the L.E.A. focused on user satisfaction and on changes in beginning teacher attitudes.

6. The Wilmette, Ill., Program for Beginning Teachers (Wilmette Public Schools, 1969)

This federally funded (Title 3) program for beginning teachers with 0-2 years experience was initiated in 1968-69. In its initial year the project serviced 80 beginning teachers in 9 public and private Wilmette, Illinois, elementary schools. The program consisted of a five-day summer orientation workshop and one-half day per month released time for beginning teachers to participate in workshops, demonstrations, classroom observations and individual consultations. Additionally, eight Saturday workshops were held on issues related to curriculum, teaching methods and instructional materials. Experienced "helping teachers" were appointed to work with four to six beginning teachers in planning and self-evaluation and they observed neophytes' classes. These helping teachers were given some unspecified form of supervisory training and limited released time. Finally, university advisor-consultants were available on scheduled in-service days to provide additional assistance to beginning teachers.

All of the assistance given in this program was totally separate from the district's teacher evaluation procedures. Also, an attempt was made to provide an individualized program for each neophyte and to meet beginning teacher needs as they emerged. At the end of the first year of the program, plans were underway to form an Advisory Council of all representative interest groups. The Institute for Educational Development in Downers Grove, Illinois, served as a consultant to the L.E.A. in conducting a program evaluation which focused on the degree to which neophytes felt that their needs were being met and with the satisfaction with the program expressed by all role groups.

7. The New York City Supportive Training Program for Inexperienced and New Teachers (Honigman, 1970)

This pilot program funded by the New York Office of Urban Education was initiated in 1968-69 to provide supportive services for beginning teachers and to reduce teacher dropout rates in schools with a history of high teacher turnover. The program was concentrated primarily in low income areas of Manhattan, Brooklyn, and the Bronx. The content consisted of providing skilled and experienced "master teachers" to serve as consultant resources for beginning teachers. These master teachers assisted individual neophytes in many areas including curriculum implementation, establishing classroom routines and teaching methods. Some in-service workshops were also conducted for groups of beginning teachers. Each master teacher worked with approximately 9 neophytes and was given 100% released time. Additionally, a wide variety of school district specialists were made available to the program as back-up resources. The N.Y.C. Office of Personnel provided some unspecified training and support for the 152 master teachers. A program evaluation was conducted by the Office of Urban Education in which STINT teachers were compared with a control group of beginning teachers in similar settings. This evaluation was concerned with the amount of staff turnover, observations of neophytes' classes, teacher and student attitudes and the extent to which the program was implemented.

8. The South Texas New Teacher Orientation Project (Dooley, 1970)

This project, which involved 6 L.E.A.'s, 2 I.H.E.'s and a regional educational service center, was initiated in 1968-69 with the involvement of 357 beginning teachers (either new to the profession or new to a school district). The program was designed to strengthen the teaching skills and professional commitment of new teachers to work with low income Mexican-American pupils in Rio

Grande boarder schools. The first phase of the program involved giving beginning teachers released time to attend one-hour monthly small group discussion-training sessions led by university consultants and assisted by experienced teachers. These seminars were largely unstructured and focused on the concerns expressed by beginning teachers. There was also a limited but unspecified amount of released time provided for neophytes to observe experienced teachers. An evaluation conducted by the educational service center consisted of a questionnaire which was sent to all of the program participants at the end of the first year of operation. The focus of the questionnaire was on the extent to which program objectives were achieved, the job satisfaction of beginning teachers, projected teacher turnover, and detailed feedback about the value of the small group sessions. In the second year of operation a group of the original neophytes produced a teacher orientation booklet for use in Rio Grande schools.

9. The Washington, D.C., Program for the Recruitment of Beginning Teachers (Scates, 1970)

This federally funded (Title 5) project was designed to provide beginning teachers with support, training, and assistance to help them succeed in a large urban school district. Additionally, there was a particular focus on helping beginning teachers to use varied approaches in the teaching of reading and language arts and in developing skills in human relations. The program consisted of a two-week summer orientation workshop, 3 one-day released time workshops, and continuing individual support and assistance throughout the year. It is unclear from the report of the program how and by whom this individual assistance was provided. The first year of the program involved 36 teachers who were either new to the profession or new to the D.C. school district. A program evaluation conducted by the district R&D department

consisted of a series of questionnaires focusing on user satisfaction and on how well the program objectives were implemented.

10. The Salem, New Hampshire, Program for Helping the Beginning Teacher (Marashio, 1971)

This program was initiated to help beginning teachers in one Salem, New Hampshire, high school. The total program was carried out utilizing existing school staff and without any released time costs. There were four interrelated program components. First, each beginning teacher was paired with an experienced cooperating teacher. Each member of a dyad taught in the same subject area and had common free periods for conferencing. The cooperating teachers served as resources to the neophytes and had nothing to do with formal assessment procedures. Secondly, each beginning teacher was trained to interpret data gathered from the Flanders Interaction Analysis system. Two trained staff members observed each beginner with a Flanders and held a post-analysis session after each observation. Each beginner was observed twice in this way. Next, seminars were held every other week after school as a chance for the neophytes to exchange problems and ideas. The beginning teachers suggested the topics and speakers for these sessions. Finally, beginning teachers were observed an unspecified number of times by the curriculum coordinator and department chair with a post-analysis occurring after each lesson. Beginners were also given some opportunity to observe experienced teachers and kept a journal throughout the year. There is limited evaluation data reported on this program concerning the extent of user satisfaction.

11. The Alabama First Year Teacher Pilot Program (Alabama S.E.D., 1974; Blackburn et al., 1975)

This final and one of the most complex of the beginning teacher programs was initiated on a pilot basis in 1973-74 following a resolution by the Alabama

S.E.A. stating that I.H.E.'s, L.E.A.'s and the S.E.A. should jointly assume responsibility for the success of beginning teachers. The S.E.A. totally funded this project which involved 100 beginning elementary, secondary and special education teachers in 7 school districts during its first year of operation. A support team representing each of the three sponsoring groups provided individual support for each beginning teacher. First, there were 6 University of Alabama clinical professors, each of whom worked with 16-19 neophytes. The professors observed, demonstrated teaching techniques and helped each teacher conduct a self-assessment of their needs. Secondly, each beginning teacher was assigned to one of two S.E.A. consultants who visited with the neophytes in their classrooms and chaired support-team meetings. Finally, each L.E.A. had a program coordinator who helped beginning teachers become acquainted with the school and community and obtain instructional resources. Thus, each neophyte had a support team of three: one clinical professor, one L.E.A. coordinator, and one S.E.A. consultant. The overall goal of the program was to determine the most common and specific needs of the first year teachers and to help them assess their progress toward specified goals. An evaluation was conducted in which the 100 teachers were compared with a control group on the basis of questionnaires and interviews. The evaluation was concerned with documenting the kinds of support received by beginning teachers, teacher attitudes, student attitudes and student achievement.

Do Induction Programs Make a Difference?: A Synthesis of the Empirical Data Related to the Eleven Beginning Teacher Programs

Now that each of the programs has been briefly described, an attempt will be made to examine the results of the program evaluations. Table 1 summarizes the major elements in the eleven programs.

INSERT TABLE 1 ABOUT HERE

The program evaluations were variously concerned with five classes of variables. Rather than attempting to present a detailed description of the findings of each program, the findings related to each of these major variable groupings are presented with a view toward providing a somewhat general picture of program impact. Most of the evaluations relied heavily on the use of questionnaires for their data. For example, five of the eleven programs used this as their only means of gathering data. Other data collection methods employed were formal observations of neophytes' classes, sociometric techniques, case studies of individual teachers, documentation of actual practice through logs, and informal observations by project staff. Only one project (Alabama) utilized interviews of program participants. This lack of interviews is a a serious shortcoming given the findings by Bouchard and Hull (1970) that interviews are a valuable means of gathering information about teacher induction and that interview results often contradict data gathered by questionnaires. Only three projects (Alabama, N.Y.C., and Washington State) employed a comparison of experimental and control groups.

1. User Satisfaction and Extent of Program Implementation

One of the most common concerns of program evaluators was with the extent to which the programs were actually implemented and the extent to which participants were satisfied with the results. Generally, most of the programs indicate a high degree of user satisfaction and a high degree of accomplishment in meeting program objectives. For example, the neophytes in the Oswego program overwhelmingly indicated that team supervision helped them to gain new insights about their teaching and to improve their classroom performance. Also, 94 percent

of the participants in the Washington, D.C., program felt that the topics in their seminars and workshops were fairly well covered.

Evaluations consistently indicate high neophyte interest and enthusiasm in the programs. The only notable exception to a generally enthusiastic participant response was in some of the comments made by participants in the South Texas project. Here, despite general participant approval, there appeared to be many problems in attendance at meetings and some resentment toward the unstructured approach of the university group leaders. One program (Washington, D.C.) cited high seminar attendance as a sign of neophyte interest in the program.

Despite the fact that these findings are consistently positive, they should be regarded with caution because of the limited ways in which most of the data were collected (e.g., heavy reliance on questionnaires). It is felt that,if information had been more systematically collected, more varied responses would have surfaced as was the case in the Texas project.

2. Teacher Turnover

Two of the projects attempted to assess the effect of a planned induction program on the usually high degree of teacher turnover. First, in the N.Y.C. project, experimental teachers had a significantly lower turnover (resignations and transfers) than the control group. In the Texas project, 72 percent of the program participants indicated through a questionnaire that they planned to return to their district the following year. Given the great deal of attention that is given to the problem of "teacher wastage" in the literature, it is surprising that so few of the programs attempted to assess this variable.

3. Teacher Performance

Three projects (Alabama, N.Y.C. and Washington State) report data on various aspects of teacher performance. These data were gathered through

the use of classroom observation systems and questionnaires. First, Hite et al. (1966) utilized a classroom observation system in Washington State to analyze the existence of specific teacher behaviors assumed to be associated with effective teaching. Although no statistically significant differences were found between experimentals and controls on the behaviors in question, the experimental groups did score higher on 28 of the 30 measures. These relative differences were maintained one year later. Despite the fact that the differences did not reach statistical significance, the researchers utilize them as support in arguing the benefits of reduced loads and intensive supervision.

The N.Y.C. project utilized an observational system to measure the degree of teacher flexibility and openness of communication. The experimental group was superior to the control group on only one of the measures: the number of spontaneous, unsolicited student comments. This difference was not statistically significant. Also, STINT principals consistently rated their beginning teachers higher than control teachers were rated by their principals on a questionnaire completed at the end of the year. The criteria on which these evaluations were based were not reported. Finally, it was predicted that experimental teachers would indicate more accepting and less punitive responses to stressful classroom situations presented on a questionnaire. This did not happen.

In the Alabama project, classroom observations and principal ratings were employed to assess the relative competence of experimental and control groups. There were no statistically significant differences indicated by the classroom observation system, but principals consistently rated experimental teachers higher than control teachers on some unspecified criteria.

Generally, these results related to teacher performance are highly equivocal. Although there appear to be a few indications that planned induction experiences result in superior classroom performance, the facts that many of the results are not statistically significant and the evaluative criteria are often unspecified make any clear conclusions problematic. Furthermore, even when the evaluation criteria were specified, there are still difficulties. Recent research on teacher effectiveness (e.g., Medley, 1977) indicates that it is highly questionable that one can assume the existence of universal criteria of effectiveness. Instead, teacher effectiveness appears to be highly situation-specific and dependent upon factors like subject area and grade level. Even if the Washington State study had shown that experimentals were statistically superior to the controls, the value of this information for teacher induction would have been questionable.

4. Teacher Attitudes and Morale

There were four projects that attempted to assess (through questionnaires) the effect of planned induction experiences on beginning teacher attitudes and morale. First, the M.T.A.I. was administered (pre and post) to all of the neophytes in the Wheeling, Illinois, program. There was a slight, but not statistically significant increase in scores by the end of the year. However, despite the lack of significance, evaluators point to the data as a positive sign because the M.T.A.I. scores did not drop as in the case of so many other studies (e.g., Day, 1959).

In Washington State, a teacher attitude scale was administered to experimental and controls at both the beginning and the end of the year. The results show that there were no significant differences between the two groups; both

sets of scores dropped over the course of the year. In the Alabama project teacher attitudes were also measured through the pre- and post-administration of a questionnaire. There were no statistically significant differences between the experimentals and controls.

Finally, in the N.Y.C. project an attempt was made to assess the relative morale and job satisfaction of experimental and control teachers. Experimental teachers scored consistently higher than the controls on Purdue Teacher Opinionnaire. Statistically significant differences were related to total scores and scores on two factors: teacher rapport and teacher load. Satisfaction with teaching was higher for the experimentals, but the difference was not statistically significant. Thus, teacher attitude measures show some indications of being modified positively by induction efforts, but here, as in the case of teacher performance measures, clear conclusions are not possible.

5. Pupil Performance and Attitudes

Two projects examined the effects of their efforts on various aspects of pupil attitudes and behavior. First, in the N.Y.C. project, sociometric tests were examined from the classes of both experimental and control teachers. There were no differences found in the number of isolates and rejectees in the two groups of classrooms. Secondly, the Alabama project reports measures of both student performance as measured by standardized tests and student attitudes towards their peers and school in general. There were no significant differences between experimentals and controls on any of the measures. The effect of induction programs on pupils has not received much attention by program evaluators, but the little data that does exist does not show any effect.

6. Informal Observations by Project Staff and Other Miscellaneous Criteria

This category encompasses a wide range of informal assessments and observations made by those involved in implementing the programs. For example, in Wilmette, Illinois, the project staff noted a general concern for self-improvement on the part of the beginning teachers. They also claim that the excitement generated by the project permeated the entire district as evidenced by experienced teachers requesting similar programs. Also, in Wheeling, Illinois, the project staff cites as evidence for the success of their project the fact that the L.E.A. picked up the total cost for the project when the federal funds ran out. Generally, all of the participants in the eleven programs were enthusiastically positive about their experiences. Despite the fact that many of the evaluation results are highly equivocal, each program report concludes with an affirmation of the benefits to be accrued from implementing a planned induction program for beginning teachers. Teacher induction programs, just by their existence, appear to sensitize school personnel to the problems of the first year of teaching and to generally help neophytes feel better about themselves and their jobs. Whether teacher induction programs actually improve teacher classroom performance is not totally clear from the data which exist.

What Have We Learned From Experience?: Some Generalizations

Although the eleven programs examined above were conducted under highly dissimilar conditions, employed very different means to induct beginning teachers and produced highly equivocal evaluation data, there are still several generalizations which can be made as a result of these efforts. The following statements are based on analyses of recommendations made by project staff and evaluators and on a close reading of program descriptions.

1. Those who have given beginning teachers released time to participate in induction activities (and even those who did not) often cite released time for neophytes as one of the most important factors in the success of a program. Generally, induction activities seem to be more highly valued if they take place during the school day and as part of a teacher's load. Furthermore, released time needs to be carefully planned in advance to enable schools to secure adequate replacement staff.

2. The presence of experienced teachers who are able to provide assistance and guidance to beginning teachers is also frequently cited as a crucial element in an induction program. Furthermore, these mentors should be given some released time to engage in their activities and some initial training and continuing support in methods of supervision. Finally, separating the assistance given by these experienced teachers from formal teacher assessment procedures is often seen as necessary to avoid the ritualized behavior that is so often associated with supervisory practice. For example,

> It soon became apparent that a cooperating teacher's effectiveness decreased as the amount of supervisory authority he had over the new teacher increased. The beginning teacher, for example, was not completely open with the cooperating teacher if the latter was responsible for evaluating him. Since one of the cooperating teacher's most important functions was to assist in the solution of problems (classroom discipline, for instance) this confidence was crucial. (Swanson, 1968, p. 76)

3. The success of an induction program seems to be closely related to the degree to which building administrators and other teachers understand and support the program. Efforts should be made to insure that the induction program is adequately explained to all parties (not just neophytes and mentors) and that the program does not greatly interfere with normal school operations. Induction must be seen as an integral part of and not in isolation from the context of the school.

4. Although it has been shown that both major categories of beginning teachers (those new to the profession; those new to a district) benefit from induction activities, there have been some problems associated with providing the same activities to both sets of teachers. Programs should be designed to distinguish between these two types of "beginners" as their needs are often very different.

5. It seems desirable to involve neophytes in all stages of the planning and implementation of an induction program. Although studies on the needs and concerns of beginners show a great deal of commonality (e.g., changes from practical and self-oriented concerns to more long-range and student-oriented concerns over time), attention should be given to the emerging needs of specific groups of beginners at particular points in time in specific contexts. Each beginner brings a somewhat different background or latent culture to the profession and has particular needs and concerns which cannot necessarily be predicted in advance.

6. There are various trade-offs involved in making choices between the provision of group and individual assistance. For example, while individual assistance may be able to more adequately respond to the needs and concerns of each beginner and lead to a greater accomplishment of program objectives, the financial costs involved are often high and may even be prohibitive. On the other hand, group sessions seem to be more economical in the use of consultant time and in avoiding overlap, but may often fail to provide for the needs of each beginner. In any case, there seems to be high therapeutic value associated with neophyte's contacts with their peers in group seminars and workshops. Some mixture of group sessions and individual assistance is the strategy most typically employed and may be the most appropriate course of action.

7. In-class support for beginners a la Katz's "advisory approach" seems to be a very valuable aspect of an induction program. Although seminars and workshops have been shown to be successful, neophytes most often praise the assistance that comes through the in-class involvement of an experienced teacher.

8. There appear to be many benefits to be gained through interinstitutional cooperation in planned teacher induction programs. I.H.E.'s definitely have a role to play in induction, particularly in providing supervisory training and continuing support to experienced teacher mentors. S.E.A.'s can play a particularly useful role in encouraging experimentation in induction programming and in coordinating interinstitutional efforts within a state.[6] Many programs specifically recommend the formation of a formal Advisory Council composed of representatives from all interest groups as a useful means of coordinating the activities of a program.

9. Some type of orientation program before school begins (either in the summer and/or at the beginning of the term) is often cited as an essential element of an induction program. This orientation should be in addition to or in place of the normal orientation procedures for all teachers. As mentioned previously, this seems to be the most prevalent and in fact often the only form of teacher induction in existence today.

10. Teacher induction programs are often possible through a reutilization of existing school resources. It is not the case that large sums of money need to be secured from state and federal agencies to begin a formalized program for beginning teachers. While external funding obviously allows for a greater amount of support and a more economical use of resources, the programs in places like Salem, New Hampshire, and Wheeling, Illinois, demonstrate that L.E.A.'s can provide some forms of support on their own. In fact, in the

long run it may be the programs that are carried out at little additional cost that may have the greatest impact. If a program is totally dependent upon outside funding, there is not much that can be done once the funds run out. While it is important to continue our efforts to secure additional and permanent resources for teacher induction, it is also important to make provisions for induction to continue once funding disappears.

11. If it is true, as is predicted by many (e.g., Howey, 1976), that formalized teacher induction programs will increasingly be implemented, then we will need more adequate methods of evaluating such programs and more communication among the practitioners who implement them. The evaluation data which presently exist tell us very little about why such programs succeed and fail in different contexts. Interviews and case studies may be particularly useful means of gathering information about induction, especially in combination with the more conventional procedures of administering questionnaires. As will be indicated shortly, there is a lot we can learn from the British experience in terms of evaluation methodologies and procedures for disseminating evaluation results.

Given that these generalizations are based on a very limited analysis of a few beginning teacher programs, they should be regarded with extreme tentativeness. Also, the question of the possibilities for degree-related (internship) programs for beginning teachers has not been addressed in the present paper. Hopefully, as we begin to develop better methods of program evaluation and begin to share our results, our knowledge about this crucial stage of teacher education will become more sophisticated. Following is a brief analysis of some of the recent induction activities in Great Britain and some of their possible implications for the design of future efforts in the United States.

Teacher Induction in Great Britain

Following the James Report (1972) and a series of teacher induction action research projects conducted from 1968-72 (Bolam, 1973), a government White Paper (1972) outlined a series of specific proposals for the induction of probationary teachers. Among the actions recommended for the probationary year were: (1) that probationers receive reduced (3/4) teaching loads; (2) that probationers receive not less than 1/5 released time to attend induction activities within their schools and at professional centers; (3) that professional tutors be appointed in each school and receive training for the purpose of assisting probationers; (4) that a network of professional centers be established in existing training institutions and teachers' centers to offer external support to probationers in the form of workshops and courses.

The White Paper also outlined steps for a pilot induction scheme to be carried out in four areas prior to the projected implementation of a national induction scheme in 1975-76. However, because of financial difficulties, the pilot scheme could only be mounted officially in two districts: the urban district of Liverpool and the largely rural district of Northumberland. Several other areas initiated informal schemes on their own without the support of government funding. Together, the sponsored and unsponsored schemes make up the Teacher Induction Pilot Scheme (TIPS) which was eventually funded through 1977-78. Bolam et al. (1977) report that there are now plans to phase into a national induction scheme by 1981.

Because there are several excellent and detailed descriptions of the TIPS project which exist in the literature of three countries (Great Britain, Australia, and the United States),[7] no attempt will be made here to duplicate these efforts and to present an exhaustive analysis of these complex and

varied schemes. Instead, after a brief overview of the major elements of the two sponsored schemes, the focus will shift to some of the recent conclusions which have tentatively been drawn from these efforts and to the ways in which the British have approached evaluating and disseminating information about teacher induction programs.

An Overview of the Liverpool and Northumberland Induction Schemes

There are several common elements to be found in the two sponsored pilot induction schemes. First, following the recommendations of the White Paper, each scheme gave probationers reduced (75%) teaching loads and appointed at least one experienced teacher tutor in each school to guide and assist probationers.[8] These teacher tutors received brief periods of training at professional centers and one-quarter day of released time for each probationer with whom they worked. Special induction courses were also set up which provided a point of reference for probationers independent of their employers and opportunities for them to share their experiences and ideas with other probationers. These center-based induction courses were usually planned by "working parties" composed mainly of teachers. Finally, each scheme had a formal Advisory Council which began functioning during the 1973-74 planning year and continued to the end of the project.

Beyond these general similarities, there were many differences in the ways in which specific activities were carried out in practice. The major differences between the two projects were in the structure of external courses for probationers and in the balance between school-based and center-based activities. These differences were related to the particular characteristics of each L.E.A. For example, in Liverpool six professional centers were established within local I.H.E.'s and teachers' centers. Each probationer

in Liverpool was assigned to one of the professional centers. On the other hand, in Northumberland, where there were no colleges or teachers' centers in which to establish professional centers and where the distances between schools was very great, more extensive use was made of block release courses for probationers.

In Liverpool during the first year of implementation (1974-75) there was a gradual shift from school-based to center-based activities over the course of the year. Most probationers attended 3 one-day courses in the fall of 1974 and spent one day per week at a professional center during the spring. On the other hand, in Northumberland one-half day per week was utilized for school-based activities and the additional half days were accumulated for one week block release courses each term. The specific patterns of released time in each scheme have changed over the life of the projects, but generally there is an increase in structured activities during the spring term.

The composition of the teacher tutor group was also very different in the two schemes. For example, in 1974-75, over one half of the tutors in Liverpool were heads or deputy heads. This apparently caused some problems in that probationers were often reluctant to seek help from their tutor if the latter was his or her head. On the other hand, less than 10 percent of the tutors in Northumberland were persons in an administrative capacity. Most were experienced teachers who did not play a formal role in the probationers' assessments at the end of the year. The debate over whether heads should serve as tutors is still unresolved, but there is strong sentiment in favor of retaining a separation between assessment and support. Most L.E.A.'s recommend that heads should be selected as tutors only as a last resort.

Bolam (1977) reports that there are several specific stages within which these induction programs were carried out. These stages were initially formulated

during the 1968-72 action research projects and appear to have held up during the pilot induction period. They are:

1. The appointment and placement period
2. Orientation--either a pre-service visit or an orientation at the beginning of the term (in addition to the regular orientation procedures for all teachers)
3. An Autumn Term Adaptation Period--the program is largely school-based
4. A Spring and Summer Term Development Period--a more structured training program which is more heavily center-based than Phase 3
5. The Summer Term Assessment of each probationer
6. A July Review Period--an overall program evaluation made by all participants through a series of "review conferences"

Generally, these two induction schemes have been judged to be quite successful by probationers, teachers, heads and other staff. The provision of released time for each probationer and the availability of teacher tutors in each school were clearly the most valued aspects of the two projects. Although external courses were also valued by a substantial minority of participants, school-based induction activities were generally more favorably received.

Along with this generally favorable participant response, there were a number of problems which arose in each project. This is to be expected given the newness and complexity of the schemes. Following are a few examples of the kinds of problems which have arisen. This list is by no means exhaustive.

1. There were many difficulties in obtaining suitable replacement staff for probationers, especially at the nursery level and in some of the specialist fields at the secondary level. Also, it was not always possible to free probationers and tutors at the same time.

2. There were numerous problems associated with the role of teacher tutor. For example, "it has become apparent from the Liverpool scheme that

while a teacher tutor may be provided with information and suggestions about how he might carry out his functions, many tutors either disagree with or ignore suggestions or do not have the necessary skills at their command" (Davis, 1977, p. 47). One particular area of difficulty was with tutors' attitudes about entering a classroom to observe a probationer's teaching. Although the organizers of both pilot schemes specifically intended that tutors would play active (interventionist) roles in the development of probationers, many tutors limited themselves to supportive (pastoral) roles (e.g., waiting to be approached with problems). The lack of a tradition of colleague observation in many schools and an association of observation with assessment were some of the conditions which combined to prevent the planned role of tutor from being actualized.

3. There was some reluctance on the part of experienced teachers to offer assistance to probationers and to allow probationers to observe their classes. This problem has been partially solved in Liverpool by the compilation of a "Directory of Skills" which lists experienced teachers who were identified as particularly successful in particular curriculum areas and who gave their consent to probationer visits.

4. There was some feeling among probationers that external courses duplicated previous college work and that the topics and methods of presentation were sometimes irrelevant to their present needs. This criticism was balanced by the fact that many probationers valued the centers for the opportunities they afforded for meeting and discussing with their peers and for the facilities which they offered.

Despite numerous difficulties like the ones above, feelings still remained generally positive about the two schemes. The criticisms have been directed at particular features of the schemes rather than at the schemes as a whole.

In consensus statements prepared for the 1977 national conference on induction, the advisory councils of both Liverpool and Northumberland strongly recommended the implementation of an induction scheme on a national basis.

Some Conclusions from the TIPS Experience

The purpose of the 1977 National Conference on Teacher Induction (Bolam et al., 1977) was to draw together the practical lessons which had been learned from the sponsored and unsponsored induction schemes. Following are some of the conclusions which were reached as a result of the interactions among TIPS practitioners and evaluators during this conference.

1. Induction programs clearly have an impact beyond the new teachers they are intended to help as they inevitably involve experienced teachers and entire school staffs. Therefore, an induction program cannot be conceived of outside of the normal school context and present school commitments to all other activities. School staff support for induction activities is essential and the program must be seen as an integral part of a school's total program of staff development.

2. Induction programs also have an impact on the relationships between institutions. For example, the Liverpool Advisory Committee cited that the induction scheme led to vastly improved relations between the colleges and the schools on matters which transcended induction. When institutions collaborate in induction, the effects seem to be widespread and generally positive despite the inevitable problems which are involved.

3. Because the purpose of induction is not only to help the new teacher to function effectively in a particular school but also to foster professional competence in the wider sense, probationers need the support of external agencies (e.g., teachers' centers and training institutions). Probationers

need to spend some time outside of the school to be able to see their task in perspective.

4. The establishment of an Advisory Committee of representative teachers, probationers, L.E.A. staff, and external agency staff has proven to be an essential feature of an induction scheme.

5. The general feeling is that any scheme must include an organized period of pre-service orientation in addition to the regular orientation for all teachers so that the probationer can become familiar with his or her future place of work.

6. If induction is to be successful, adequate released time must be provided to the probationers and to those who are to help them so that they can effectively carry out their roles. Adequate replacement staff must be made available to make this possible.

7. Many of the "helping roles," for example, that of the teacher tutor, require a planned program of preparation and training if the roles are to be carried out as intended.

8. The training of teacher tutors is a particularly crucial issue in teacher induction. If tutors are expected to play an interventionist role in the development of probationers, then brief training sessions prior to the term are not adequate. Teacher tutors need continuing training and support as they carry out their roles and time to meet and discuss with their peers. The main skills which are often suggested for inclusion in such training are those in adult counseling, analysis of teaching and clinical supervision.

9. There is widespread agreement that the role of teacher tutor should be extended beyond involvement with probationers and be more closely aligned with the role as originally defined in the James Report. While there is some disagreement over whether the role should include work with teachers in-service,

there is strong sentiment that the teacher tutor should also work with students during their practice teaching.

10. The organizers of induction programs are inevitably confronted with some degree of conflict between training needs as perceived by probationers and the needs identified by schools and L.E.A.'s. While induction programs need to maintain a balance in the long run between these two perceptions of needs and, in fact, the two may often overlap, practical relevance is the primary indicator that probationers will use to judge the effectiveness of an induction program.

While the above are only a few of the more general conclusions that were reached at the 1977 national conference, it is interesting to note their high degree of similarity with some of the conclusions reached in the U.S. There seem to be many essential elements and consequences of induction programs which transcend national boundaries. While it is not suggested here that attempts be made to transpose particular features of the British designs into the U.S., it is felt that there is much to be gained for U.S. induction efforts from examining the wealth of descriptive material which exists on the TIPS project. Despite the great differences in teacher training between the two countries, there is still much that can be adapted from the British experience. The British discussions on the training of teacher tutors are particularly relevant for the designers of teacher induction programs in the U.S.

Methods of Evaluation and Dissemination

When the TIPS project was funded, the Department of Education and Science appointed two local evaluators (one based at each sponsored site) and a national evaluation team based at the University of Bristol. The national evaluation team, under the direction of Ray Bolam, was responsible for monitoring and

evaluating developments in Liverpool and Northumberland and in several of the unsponsored schemes. Unlike many of the evaluators of teacher induction programs in the U.S. who focused almost exclusively on the measurement of program outcomes, the British evaluators attempted to construct comparative case studies of each of the induction schemes. Bolam (1976) affiliates these evaluation efforts with the methods of "illuminative evaluation" described by Parlett and Hamilton (1976). According to Parlett and Hamilton:

> Illuminative evaluation is not a standard methodological package, but a general research strategy. It aims to be both adaptable and eclectic. The choice of research tactics follows not from research doctrine, but from decisions in each case as to the best available techniques: the problem defines the methods and not vice versa. Equally no method (with its own built-in limitations is used exclusively or in isolation, different techniques are combined to throw light on a common problem. (1976, p. 16)

Rather than relying exclusively on the use of questionnaires, as was the case in many of the U.S. evaluations, the British employed a number of different methods of gathering data and cross-checked their findings from many perspectives. For example, Bolam (1976, p. 23) points out that:

> The basic general criterion adopted to assess the success of the schemes was that of informed professional judgement: the views of those involved were obtained through questionnaires, intensive interviews, case studies, and observations. In this way the evaluators have gained a reasonably comprehensive picture of the range of opinions on the scheme held by probationers, teacher tutors, heads, professional centre staff, advisers, and administrators.

This attempt to provide illuminative descriptions of the activities and consequences (anticipated and unanticipated) of the pilot induction schemes should serve as a model for evaluators of induction programs in the U.S. As Romberg and Fox (1976) point out, the assumptions underlying many of the standard evaluation procedures so often employed in U.S. teacher education program evaluations are rarely met when the subject of the evaluation is a dynamic training program operating in a complex learning milieu.

If evaluations of U.S. teacher induction programs are going to provide information that will enable others to adapt the salient features of these programs to other sites, then we will have to broaden our conception of program evaluation somewhat along the lines of the British approach. While it is not being advocated here that we necessarily adopt the specific methods outlined by Parlett and Hamilton (1976)—many other excellent illuminative approaches exist—we should abandon attempts to rely exclusively on the narrow range of information provided by the questionnaire. The complex reality of teacher induction programs requires that evaluators seek more formative and comprehensive data. While there is some indication that evaluations of U.S. induction programs are going to move in such a direction in the near future (e.g., NIE, 1978), at the present time we have only very limited kinds of information about the specific features of teacher induction programs which lead to success or failure under different conditions.

In addition to the efforts that were made to evaluate the various sponsored and unsponsored induction schemes, two D.E.S. funded national conferences were held at the University of Bristol (1975, 1977) on the problems of teacher induction. Among those in attendance at these sessions were representatives from each of the sponsored schemes and several of the unsponsored schemes, local and national evaluators, and officials from the D.E.S. The purpose of the first of these conferences was described by Bolam and Baker (1975, pp. 1-2) as follows:

1. To facilitate the exchange between the participants, of practical information, ideas and materials about the organization and implementation of various types of induction programs at the levels of the L.E.A., the professional centre and the school.

2. The creation of an informal communication network of people and institutions engaged in mounting induction programs.

In addition to attempting to further the accomplishment of these two goals, the 1977 national conference was designed to try to draw together the practical lessons which had been learned from the various induction schemes and to inform members of the D.E.S. about the major areas of agreement and disagreement. The D.E.S. would then make plans based on the results of this conference for the gradual introduction of a national induction scheme. The proceedings from both of these conferences were published by the University of Bristol.

These efforts to disseminate information about teacher induction programs are in sharp contrast to the situation in the U.S. where programs are mounted and evaluations conducted in the absence of planned efforts to coordinate the sharing of information about the results of these experiences. There has not been a major conference specifically concerned with the problem of teacher induction in the U.S. since the 1965 NCTEPS conference on "The Real World of the Beginning Teacher." Even then, the focus was largely on the problems of the first year teacher and not on analyses of the successes and failures of planned teacher induction programs.

While it is not being suggested here that we in the U.S. necessarily think in terms of a nationally coordinated effort in teacher induction, we should at the very least emulate the British approach to dissemination and provide more opportunities for those engaged in mounting and evaluating teacher induction programs to share their experiences. In many ways, it was much easier for this author to gather information about the TIPS project than it was to bring together information concerning the experimental efforts in the U.S. The information on the U.S. programs was widely scattered and mostly unpublished. Given that teacher induction programs will probably become more prevalent in the U.S. in the near future, this situation must be remedied.

Conclusion

While much has been learned about teacher induction programs from the experiences in the U.S. and Great Britain, one of the most valuable conceptual insights about induction comes from some of the work that is currently being conducted in Australia. Tisher (1979) makes the enormously important statement that the problem of induction must necessarily be seen as a reciprocal process between the neophytes and the profession. In other words, it is not only a question of what we can do to improve the neophytes' adjustment to the profession as it exists, but it is also a matter of how we can make the maximum use of the ideas and skills that neophytes bring with them; inputs which offer valuable opportunities for the continual adaptation of the profession to changing societal conditions.

The fact is that, no matter what we do in a teacher induction program in attempting to shape the attitudes and behaviors of neophytes, the beginners do not merely become what we wish them to become. While neophytes are necessarily constrained by institutional forces, they are at the same time creatively acting in ways to transform the social order to which they are becoming a part. No program of teacher induction can cast neophytes into standardized molds. This being so, it is absolutely essential that we make every effort to take advantage of the new knowledge and skills that neophytes have to offer. Presently, as Tisher (1979) points out, it is very rare that a teacher induction program makes opportunities available for neophytes to share their ideas and insights with their more experienced colleagues.

The work on teacher induction has barely begun, but we must resist the tendency which now predominates to define induction as a one-way process of situational adjustment. Teacher induction, which is one instance of the problem

of teacher socialization, must define neophytes as active contributors to their own professional development and not merely as empty vessels to be filled with the values and customs of the profession.[9] Unless we define teacher induction in this way, the abundant opportunities which now exist to improve the first years of teaching will be lost.

Notes

[1]Although the concept of continuing education for teachers has received attention for most of this century, recent research on teacher effectiveness (e.g., Medley, 1977) has added additional evidence in support of the argument for formalized training beyond the pre-service level. This work, in indicating that effective teaching is largely situation specific, emphasizes the fact that no pre-service teacher education program, however good, can produce a fully developed teacher capable of functioning in all situations.

[2]Although induction often refers to the first few (1-3) years of teaching, it is common practice in Australia and Great Britain to define induction as taking place solely during the first year of service. This author feels that the wider definition of induction is more appropriate for the U.S. context since probationary status often extends beyond the first year.

[3]In addition to the work in Great Britain, there is also much attention being given to teacher induction programs in Australia (e.g., Tisher et al., 1978; Fyfield et al., 1978; Tisher, 1979). These Australian studies on teacher induction will not be discussed in the present paper.

[4]This author is presently involved in an analysis of current teacher induction practices in Southern Wisconsin. Although this study is still in progress, we have tentatively found little distinction between beginning and experienced teachers in terms of workload and support. The only induction activity designed specifically for beginning teachers which we have found so far is the adding of a few additional days to the regular orientation session at the beginning of the year. This finding is in agreement with an assertion made by Howey (1977) that the "orientation add-on" is the most prevalent induction practice in the U.S. today.

[5]These eleven programs were selected after a thorough search of major educational journals and the ERIC system. No attempts were made to contact L.E.A.'s or S.E.A.'s to seek out additional information concerning induction programs not reported in the literature. Also, several interesting programs were eliminated from the review because of a lack of evaluation data. Finally, this author does not have any information concerning the present status of any of the efforts which are reported here.

[6]Florio and Koff's (1977) model legislation specifically addresses the problem of teacher induction and may be particularly useful to those S.E.A.'s who are interested in becoming more actively involved with the problems of the first years of teaching.

[7]The major sources which were utilized in the present paper for gathering information about recent British experiments in teacher induction were: (1) British--Bolam and Baker (1975); Hill (1975); Bolam (1976); Bolam et al. (1977); (2) American—Julius (1976); (3) Australian—Fyfield et al. (1978).

[8]In most cases, these teacher tutors were appointed from within existing school staffs. However, external tutors were appointed to supplement the internal tutors for nursery probationers in Liverpool. On the other hand, many of the unsponsored schemes relied primarily on the use of external visiting tutors.

[9]This notion of the reciprocal nature of teacher socialization is more fully elaborated by Lacy (1977) and Zeichner (1979).

References

Alabama State Department of Education. The first-year teacher pilot program: An interim report. Montgomery: Alabama State Department of Education, July, 1974. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED102141)

Association for Student Teaching. Internships in teacher education. Washington, D.C.: AST, 1968.

Blackburn, J., and Crandall, J. Preliminary results of a first-year teacher pilot program. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C., April, 1975. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED104805)

Bolam, R. Induction programmes for probationary teachers. Bristol: University of Bristol School of Education, 1973.

Bolam, R. Innovation in in-service education and training of teachers: United Kingdom. Bristol: OCED, 1976.

Bolam, R. Training the trainees. In R. Bolam et al. (Eds.), The 1977 conference on teacher induction. Bristol: University of Bristol School of Education, 1977.

Bolam, R., and Baker, K. The T.I.P.S. project 1975 national conference report. Bristol: University of Bristol School of Education, 1975.

Bolam, R., Baker, K., McMahon, A., Davis, J., and McCabe, C. The 1977 national conference on teacher induction. Bristol: University of Bristol School of Education, 1977.

Bouchard, J., and Hull, R. A pilot study of problems and practices in the induction of beginning teachers. Fredonia, NY: State University of New York at Fredonia, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED040157)

Broadbent, F., and Cruickshank, D. The identification and analyses of problems of first year teachers. Brockport, NY: State University of New York, October, 1965. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED013786)

Bush, R. The formative years. In The real world of the beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1966.

Bush, R. We know how to train teachers: Why not do so. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 5-9.

Collins, M. Students into teachers. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1969.

Conant, J. The education of American teachers. New York: McGraw Hill, 1963.

Davis, J. Training the teacher tutors. In R. Bolam et al. (Eds.), The 1977 national conference on teacher induction. Bristol: University of Bristol School of Education, 1977.

Day, H. Attitude changes of beginning teachers after initial teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 1959, 10, 26-28.

Ditosto, E. In-service training for the beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: NIE, November, 1974. (ERIC Document Reporduction Service No. ED097293)

Dooley, H. A program to strengthen the skills, understandings and professional commitment of new teachers to work with poverty stricken Mexican-American pupils in S. Texas schools. Edinburg, TX: Region One Educational Service Center, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED045564)

Dropkin, and Taylor, M. Perceived problems of beginning teachers and related factors. Journal of Teacher Education, 1963, 14, 384-390.

Eddy, E. Becoming a teacher. New York: Teachers College Press, 1969.

Florio, D., and Koff, R. Model state legislation: Continuing professional education for school personnel. Washington, D.C.: N.I.E., 1977.

Gorton, R. Comments on research: The beginning teacher. NASSP Bulletin, 1973, 57, 26-30.

Hanson, D., and Herrington, M. From college to classroom: The probationary year. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1976.

Hermanowicz, H. The pluralistic world of beginning teachers. In N.C.T.E.P.S. The real world of the beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1966.

Hill, D. Experiments in induction: New approaches to the probationary year. British Journal of Teacher Education, 1975, 1, 29-40.

Hite, H. Follow-up study: Long-term effects of modified internship for beginning elementary teachers. Seattle, WA: School Information and Research Service, June, 1968. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED022715)

Hite, H., Garrison, H., and Killian, G. Effects of reduced loads and intensive in-service training upon the classroom behavior of beginning elementary school teachers. Pullman, WA: Washington State University, 1966. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED010162)

Honigman, F. An evaluation of the program: Supportive training for inexperienced and new teachers (STINT) in New York City Schools. Albany: New York State Education Department, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED051087)

Howey, K. Current perspectives and evolving trends in in-service education in the United States. Prepared for the U.S./OECD Forum of Education Organization Leaders. Presented at the NIE-OECD International Seminar on In-service Education of Teachers, Philadelphia, June/July, 1976.

Howey, K. A framework for planning alternative approaches to in-service teacher education. In H. Hite and K. Howey (Eds.), Planning in-service teacher education: Promising alternatives. Washington, D.C.: A.A.C.T.E., May, 1977.

Howey, K., Yarger, S., and Joyce, B. Improving teacher education. Washington, D.C.: Association of Teacher Educators, 1978.

Howsam, R., Corrigan, D., Denemark, G., and Nash, R. Educating a profession. Washington, D.C.: A.A.C.T.E., 1976.

Hoy, W. The influence of experience on the beginning teacher. School Review, 1968, 76, 312-323.

Hunt, D. Teacher induction: An opportunity and a responsibility. NASSP Bulletin, 1968, 52, 130-135.

James Report. Teacher education and training. London: HMSO, 1972.

Jersild, A. Behold the beginner. In NCTEPS The real world of the beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1966.

Johnson, M. A model program for teacher in-service training emphasizing the affective dimension. Arlington, IL: The Elk Grove Training and Development Center, June, 1969. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED034747)

Julius, A. Britain's new induction plan for first-year teachers. Elementary School Journal, 1976, 76, 350-357.

Lacy, C. The socialization of teachers. London: Methuen, 1977.

Leiter, M., and Cooper, M. How teacher unionists view in-service education. Teachers College Record, 1978, 80, 107-125.

Lortie, D. School teacher. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Marashio, P. A proposal for helping the beginning teacher. Clearing House, 1971, 45, 419-421.

McDonald, F. Evaluating pre-service teachers competence. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 29, 9-13.

McGinnis, C. The beginning teacher project in New York State. NASSP Bulletin, 1968, 52, 44-48.

Medley, D. Teacher Competence and teacher effectiveness: A review of the process-product research. Washington, D.C.: A.A.C.T.E., 1977.

National Commission on Teacher Education and Professional Standards. The real world of the beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1966.

National Institute of Education. Beginning teachers and internship programs (R.F.P. No. 78-0014). Washington, D.C.: N.I.E., 1978.

Noda, D. Beginning teacher development in Hawaii. NASSP Bulletin, 1968, 52, 62-72.

Parlett, M., and Hamilton, D. Evaluation as illumination: A new approach to the study of innovatory programs. In G. Glass (Ed.), Evaluation studies review annual (Volume 1). Beverly Hills: Sage, 1976.

Plowden Report. Children and their primary schools. A report of the Central Advisory Council for Education. London: H.M.S.O., 1967.

Readling, J., Barone, V., and Schaffer, R. The Oswego plan for team supervision of beginning teachers. Oswego, NY: State University of New York, October, 1967. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED029850)

Romberg, T., and Fox, G. T. Problems in analyzing dynamic events within teacher education. In G. T. Fox (Ed.), Evaluating teacher education: The 1975 CMTI Impact Study (Technical Report No. 20). Madison, WI: USOE/Teacher Corps, 1976.

Ryan, K. (Ed.). Don't smile until Christmas: Accounts of the first year of teaching. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1970.

Scates, M. An evaluation of P.R.O.B.E.—A program for the recruitment of beginning teachers. Washington, D.C.: District of Columbia Public Schools, October, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED055029)

Shaplin, J., and Powell, A. A comparison of internship programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 1964, 15, 175-183.

Swanson, P. A time to teach and a time to learn. NASSP Bulletin, 1968, 52, 74-84.

Taylor, J. K., and Dale, I. R. A survey of teachers in their first year of service. Bristol: University of Bristol School of Education, 1971.

Tisher, R. Teacher induction: An aspect of the education and professional development of teachers. A paper presented at the national invitational conference "Exploring issues in teacher education: Questions for future research," R&D Center for Teacher Education, University of Texas, Austin, January, 1979.

Tisher, R., Fyfield, J., and Taylor, S. The induction of beginning teachers in Australia. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March, 1978.

Tisher, R., Fyfield, J., and Taylor, S. Beginning to teach (Volume 1), ERDC Report No. 15. Melbourne, Australia: Monash University, 1978.

Vaughn, J. Government investments in research and development on inservice: NIE's role. Journal of Teacher Education, 1979, 30, 33-35.

White Paper. Education: A framework for expansion. Department of Education and Science. London: HMSO, 1972.

Wilmette Illinois Public Schools. Program for beginning teachers: An individualized approach to in-service education. Wilmette, IL: Wilmette Public Schools, 1970. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED036458)

Wisconsin, University of. Report of the task force on the continuing professional development of educational personnel. Madison: University of Wisconsin, September, 1978.

Zeichner, K. The dialectics of teacher socialization. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Association of Teacher Educators, Orlando, FL: February, 1979.

Table 1

A Summary of Some of the Major Elements in the Eleven Selected Beginning Teacher Programs

	Released Time for Beginning Teachers	An Experienced Teacher Mentor	Mentors Given Released Time	Mentors Given Supervisory Training	Instructional Contact With University Personnel
N.A.S.S.P.	X	X	X		
Washington State	X				
Oswego	X	X	X	X	
Hawaii		X	X	X	
Wheeling	X				
Wilmette	X	X	X	X	X
N.Y.C.		X	X	X	
South Texas	X				X
Washington, D.C.	X				
Salem		X			
Alabama					X

Table 1, Continued

	Individual In-Class Assistance	Seminars or Workshops	A Special Pre-Service Orientation	Observations of Experienced Teachers or Peers
N.A.S.S.P.	X	X	X	X
Washington State	X[1]			X[2]
Oswego	X	X		X
Hawaii	X			
Wheeling		X		X
Wilmette	X	X		
N.Y.C.	X	X		
South Texas		X		X
Washington, D.C.		X	X	
Salem	X	X		X
Alabama	X			

[1]Experimental group 1

[2]Experimental group 2